IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

FRIDAY, THE TWENTY FIRST DAY OF OCTOBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE C.V.RAMULU

-

WRIT PETITION NO : 22689 of 2005

Between:

Utla Kannayya, S/o. Kannayya,
R/o. Yerrampadu Village,

Rajavommangi Mandal,

East Godavari District.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1. The Government of the State of Andhra Pradesh,

Represented by its Secretary, Social Welfare Department,
(LTR-2), Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad.

2. The Additional Agent to the Government,

(Project Officer) East Godavari District

at Rampachodavaram.

3. The Mandal Revenue Officer, Rajavommangi,

East Godavari District.

...RESPONDENTS

* * *

ORDER:

The only grievance of the petitioner is that aggrieved by the order made in L.T.R.P.No.235 of 2004 dated 29.12.2004 on the file of the Special Deputy Collector, Tribal Welfare, Rampachodavaram, East Godavari District, he filed C.M.A.No.14 of 2005 and the same was also dismissed on 23.07.2005 by the Additional Agent to the Government (Project Officer), East Godavari District at Rampachodavaram. Aggrieved by the same he preferred a statutory revision before the 1st respondent-Government and during pendency of the revision he also filed a stay petition seeking suspension of the orders of the 2nd respondent. However, the stay petition is not yet disposed of. Therefore, the present writ petition has been filed.

2. According to the petitioner, the transactions in dispute have taken place much prior to the Act 1 of 1970 came into force and throughout the proceedings and even as of now he is in possession of the property.

3. In view of the pendency of the revision petition before the first respondent, it would be appropriate to dispose of the writ petition with a direction to the first respondent to dispose of the revision petition filed by the petitioner expeditiously, preferably within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. However, pending disposal of the revision petition, the respondents are directed not to dispossess the petitioner from the schedule land.

4. The writ petition is, accordingly, disposed of. No costs.

_____

C.V.RAMULU, J.

Date: 21st October 2005.

BSB